

**Remarks**

Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the instant application in view of the following remarks.

***Priority Date***

The Examiner has stated that "[t]his application claimed the priority of 12/19/2000". Applicant respectfully submits that this application claims a priority of 12/18/2000, as stated on page 1 at line 4 of the application, and as evidenced by the Declaration and the Official Filing Receipt for U.S. Provisional Application No. **60/256,781**, copies of which were provided in the Appendix of the reply filed on 24 January 2006. The instant application claims the benefit of U.S. Provisional Application No. **60/256,781** filed on December 18, 2000.

***Drawings***

Applicant respectfully requests replacement of sheet nos. **3** and **4** of the drawings with the corresponding replacement sheets included herewith in **Appendix A**, which have been amended to correct several minor errors in the associated reference signs, as follows.

In **FIG. 3**, the reference sign associated with the "**Pharmacy Client**" has been changed from "316" to --314--, and the reference sign associated with the "**Insurance Company Client**" has been changed from "318" to --316--, as supported by the specification on page 11 at lines 4 and 5 respectively, as originally filed; and

In **FIG. 4**, the reference sign associated with the "**Java PIDS Server**" has been changed from "304" to --302--, as supported by the specification on page 11 at line 28, as originally filed.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

*Specification*

The specification has been amended as follows so as to correct informalities and to provide for consistent usage of the associated reference signs:

On page 3 at line 25, the first occurrence of “in step **(216)**” has been deleted;

On page 11 at line 1, “**PIDS Server 304**” has been changed to --**PIDS Server 302**--, so as to be consistent with page 10 at line 31, page 11 at lines 16 and 28, and **FIG. 3**, as originally filed; and

On page 11 at lines 2 and 8, “**Internet 302**” has been changed to --**Internet 300**--, so as to be consistent with page 10 at line 30, and **FIG. 3**, as originally filed.

Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment.

*Claim Status*

Claims **1-43** are pending in the application.

Claims **1-43** stand rejected under **35 U.S.C. § 102(e)** as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2005/0020783 A1** to Fisher, or in the alternative, under **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)** as being obvious over Fisher in view of Raven [Program Codelock2] (by W. Raven Coons Jr., 1997).. (All of these rejections are listed under the heading: “**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**”)

*Claim Amendments*

Claim **20** has been amended at line 7 to insert --first-- before “passkey”, so as to provide for proper antecedent basis for “said first passkey” on line 12.

*Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) or 103(a)*

Claims **1-43** stand rejected under **35 U.S.C. § 102(e)** as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. **2005/0020783 A1** to Fisher, or in the alternative, under **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)** as being obvious over Fisher in view of Raven [Program Codelock2] (by W. Raven Coons Jr., 1997).

Applicant respectfully traverses, and respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, are proper references under **35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e)** or

**103(a)** because, as explained more fully hereinbelow, they fail to disclose all of the elements and limitations of any claims of the instant application.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)**

In view of the heading “**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**” used by the Examiner for these claim rejections, and the admission by the Examiner on page 3 of the Office Action that “Fisher does not explicitly detail the passkey and passcode information”, it would appear that the Examiner had not intended to reject the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), but instead, only under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Alternatively, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims cannot be rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Fisher because Fisher does not disclose or suggest all of the elements and limitations of the claims, including the “passkey and passcode information” as admitted by the Examiner, as well as the elements and limitations that are not satisfied under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) that are discussed further hereinbelow.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

**Regarding claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest all of the elements and limitations of claims **1, 20, 23, 33 and 40**, and therefore are not proper references under **35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) or 103(a)**. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not properly interpreted Fisher and Raven in view of the instant application, but instead, has used impermissible hindsight reasoning to reject claims **1, 20, 23, 33 and 40**. Applicant respectfully submits that, as best understood, neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest the following elements of claims **1, 20, 23, 33 and 40**:

**Portable memory element (claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40):** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest a portable memory element. As best understood, the Fisher smartcard 170 of FIG. 1 – referred to by the Examiner -- is a software plug-in associated with a software smart card, that is incorporated in an associated Web browser. Furthermore, paragraphs [0008], [0014], [0080], [0081] and [0122] of Fisher would appear to teach away from a hardware smart card that could then be portable.

**Portable memory element for storing passcode information (claims 1, 20, 23, 33**

**and 40)**: Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest a portable memory element adapted to store passcode information, wherein the passcode information is used to verify whether the first user of the portable memory element will be permitted to access the information on the portable memory element. Instead, as best understood, the server would appear to be able to access information from the software smart card of Fisher without requiring a passcode supplied by the user. Fisher would appear to disclose a personal identification number (PIN) that is used to confirm information on a software smart card, but this does not control the access to information from the software smart card, as does the passcode control access to information on the portable memory element of the instant application, but would appear to be used for purposes of verifying that the association of the user with the software smart card. The Raven reference would appear to use the terminology “passcode” and “passkey” synonymously, neither of which is used to control access to information on a portable memory element. Instead, the Raven passcode/passkey would appear to be used to control a passage through an “exit” by a user of multi-user role-playing environment involving object types including things, players, exits, rooms and programs (see **Appendix B**).

**Authentication of passcode information (claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40)**: Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest the authentication of passcode information provided by a user and associated with the portable memory element. As best understood, the Authentication Agent 120 of Fisher does not provide for controlling access by the user to the software smart card of Fisher, let alone provide for controlling access by the user to a portable memory element in accordance with the instant application. As best understood, the function of the Authentication Agent 120 is disclosed in paragraph [0181] Fisher.

**First passkey from server to client (claims 1, 20, 23, 33 and 40):** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest a first passkey that is provided by the server to the first client. The authentication process of Fisher paragraph [0092] would appear to determine whether a user is authorized to access the server, rather than whether the passcode information associated with a portable memory element is valid. Furthermore, as best understood, if the user of Fisher is authentic, the server does not provide a first passkey to the user, but instead, enables the user to communicate with the server and the associated PAMS; otherwise, the user is rejected. The passkey and passcode of the Raven reference would appear to be synonymous, and used to control a passage through an “exit” by a user of multi-user role-playing environment involving object types including things, players, exits, rooms and programs (see **Appendix B**). More particularly, as best understood, the Raven reference does not appear to disclose or suggest a subsequent first passkey returned by a server to a user if a separate passcode, first provided by the user to the server, is authentic for an associated portable memory element.

**First passkey from first user associated with first client to second user associated with second client (claims 33 and 40):** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest providing for a first user associated with the first client to provide a first passkey to at least one second user associated with at least one second client computer system.

**Communication of information with second client (claims 1, 20, 23, 33, 40):** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest providing for a first client to communicate with a second client if a second passkey corresponds to a first passkey. Instead, as best understood, in the collaboration process of Fisher of Fig. 3 and paragraph [0203] thereof, referred to by the Examiner, the communication between the first and second users does not appear to be dependent upon whether a second passkey provided by the second user to the server corresponds to a first passkey provided by the server to the first user, but instead, each user is

authenticated separately and individually, without any direct communication therebetween. More particularly, as best understood, in Fisher, the server does not provide a first passkey to the first user, the second user does not provide a second passkey (which if correct would correspond to the first passkey) to the server, the server does not determine if the second passkey corresponds to the first passkey, and the server does not provide for communication between the first and second clients responsive to this comparison.

**Personal Identification Service server of a CORBAMED system (claim 20):**

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest, or in anyway mention, a CORBAMED system.

Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest the elements and limitations of claims **1, 20, 23, 33** and **40**. Because of this, Applicant respectfully submits that claims **1, 20, 23, 33** and **40** are distinguished from Fisher and Raven, and that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **1, 20, 23, 33** and **40**, so that the rejections under **35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e)** and **103(a)** of these claims are not justified. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims **1, 20, 23, 33** and **40** in view of the above argument.

Claims **2-19** each depend upon claim **1**; claims **21** and **22** each depend upon claim **20**; claims **24-32** each depend upon claim **23**; claims **34-39** each depend upon claim **33**; and claims **41-43** each depend upon claim **40**. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that if the above argument regarding the novelty of claims **1, 20, 23, 33** and **40** in view of Fisher and Raven is accepted, then claims **2-19, 21, 22, 24-32, 34-39** and **41-43** are also distinguished from Fisher and Raven because the addition of further limitations to an already novel and non-obvious claim does not negate novelty or non-obviousness. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims **2-19, 21, 22, 24-32, 34-39** and **41-43** in view of the above argument in respect of claims **1, 20, 23, 33** and **40**.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 2 and 25,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest a method of providing for communications between a client and a server comprising providing for encrypting the transmitted signals and decrypting the received signals, wherein the client is adapted to communicate with the portable memory element. The Examiner has cited paragraph [0089]

of Fisher to support this rejection, however, as best understood, this paragraph does not appear to make any disclosure or suggestion of encryption or decryption. As best understood, it would appear that Fisher elsewhere discloses encryption of signals from the user to the server, but not vice versa. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **2** and **25**.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 3 and 26,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest a portable memory element comprising a memory card, a flash memory card or a SmartCard. As best understood, the Fisher smartcard 170 of FIG. 1 – referred to by the Examiner -- is a software plug-in associated with a software smart card, that is incorporated in an associated Web browser. Furthermore, paragraphs [0008], [0014], [0080], [0081] and [0122] of Fisher would appear to teach away from a hardware smart card that could then be portable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **3** or **26**.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 4; 5; 6; 8; 11; and 13 and counterpart claims 27; 28, 34 and 41; 29; 21 and 30; 24; and 22 respectively in view of the Raven [Program CodeLock 2] reference,** Applicant respectfully submits that the Raven reference (by W. Raven Coons Jr.), neither discloses nor suggests the elements and limitations of these claims, which the Examiner contends are each obvious in view of page 2 of the Raven reference, which is reproduced on page 22 hereinbelow.

More particularly, the Examiner contends that page 2 of the Raven reference discloses the following elements and limitations (wherein the claim numbers in brackets are counterpart to the corresponding claims that were explicitly argued by the Examiner):

Claims **4** [27]: said data comprises medical information of a person who is capable of providing said passcode information necessary to access data from said portable memory element;

Claims **5** [28, 34, 41]: said passcode information comprises at least one fingerprint of a person associated with said portable memory element;

Claims **6** [29]: said passcode information comprises either alphanumeric information or biometric information provided by a person associated with said portable memory element;

Claims 8 [21, 30]: providing for enabling said first client either to read information from, or to record information to, said portable memory device ;if said passcode information is authentic for said portable memory element

Claims 11 [24]: providing for a first user associated with said first client to provide said first passkey to at least one second user associated with at least one second client so that said at least one second user can provide said second passkey that corresponds to said first passkey; and

Claims 13 [22]: providing for enabling said at least one second client either to read information from, or to record information to, said portable memory device if said second passkey corresponds to said first passkey.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of these elements or limitations attributed to page 2 of the Raven reference are in fact disclosed or suggested therein, nor anywhere else in either Fisher or Raven..

Furthermore, Applicant respectfully submits that one of ordinary skill in the art would not combine the Raven and Fisher references, because, as best understood, the Raven reference would not appear to be relevant to an information management system as might be relevant to the instant application; but instead would appear to teach a lock program for exits that asks a person to enter a passkey in order to pass through an exit in a text-based multi user role-playing environment, given the twenty-one (21) usage of the term “player” in the Raven reference, and the teachings of the present associated Internet web site from the URL <http://users.vnet.net/raven3/homepage.html> given on page 1 of the Raven reference, which links to <http://corax.no-ip.com/index.html>, which contains a link to <http://corax.no-ip.com/mufindex.html>, and which contains a link to the file [http://corax.no-ip.com/muf/raven/What the Hell is a MUF.txt](http://corax.no-ip.com/muf/raven/What%20the%20Hell%20is%20a%20MUF.txt), which is included herewith as **Appendix B** hereof, and which explains the concepts of MUCK and MUF that are referred on to page 1 of the Raven reference, and which shed light on the apparent intent of this program.



Page 2 of Raven: program codelock2.muf

Page 2 of 16

```

    trig intostr strdecrypt strdecrypt
  then
;
;
: encode ( s -- s )
  trig "_codelock/encrypt?" getpropstr .yes? if
    trig dup timestamps pop pop pop intostr
    "_codelock/" swap strcat
    prog timestamps pop pop pop intostr
    trig intostr
    strencrypt setprop
    prog timestamps pop pop pop intostr
    strencrypt
  then
;
: otell ( s -- ) me @ location swap me @ swap notify_except ;
: otell2 ( s -- ) trig getlink swap me @ swap notify_except ;
: otell3 ( s -- )
  trig "_codelock/dest" getprop
  dup string? if atoi dbref then
  dup int? if dbref then
  dup #0 dbcmp if exit then
  swap me @ swap notify_except
;
: setup? ( -- i ) trig "_codelock/setup?" getpropstr .yes? ;
: enabled? ( d -- i )
  dup "_codelock/enabled?" getpropstr .yes?
  swap "_codelock/key" getpropstr strlen 2 > and
;
: move? ( d -- i ) "_codelock/move?" getpropstr .yes? ;
: autopass? ( -- i ) trig "_codelock/ownpass?" getpropstr .yes? if 1 else 0 then ;
: do_help
  "\r===== [Codelock2 by Raven] =====\r"
  "Wow, a codelock program with a menu system!\r"
  "Well it is pretty muc just like editplayer or those other menu-based\r"
  "programs. Isn't it FUN! :)"
  " -Just @LOCK the exit to the DBREF of this program if you haven't already.\r"
  " -Do NOT set any success messages. If you have then they will be moved\r"
  " for you. The first time you run this program it will ask you if you\r"
  " want to set the defaults. Say yes or codelock won't work.\r"
  " -Type <exit> #edit and you will enter the menu. It should be pretty\r"
  " simple from there.\r\r"
  "The list of commands are:\r"
  " #help -- Ooooh yer lookin at it!\r"
  " #help2 -- List of what props are used.\r"
  " #edit -- Enter the codelock editor.\r"
  " #hint -- Show the player a hint.\r"
  " #credits -- Something gratuituous.\r"
  strcat strcat strcat strcat strcat
  strcat strcat strcat strcat strcat
  strcat strcat strcat strcat .tell
;
: do_help2
  "\r===== [Codelock2 by Raven] =====\r"
  "str _codelock/sc -- success\r"
  "str _codelock/xsc -- success shown after entering code\r"
  "str _codelock/fl -- fail\r"
  "str _codelock/xfl -- fail shown when moved\r"
  "str _codelock/dr -- drop\r"
  "str _codelock/osc -- osuccess\r"
  "str _codelock/xosc -- osuccess after entering code\r"
  "str _codelock/ofl -- ofail\r"
  "str _codelock/xofl -- ofail shown to others when moved at dest\r"
  "str _codelock/odr -- odrop\r"
  "str _codelock/enabled? -- enable this program?\r"
```

<http://users.vnet.net/raven3/muf/raven/codelock2.muf>

07/18/2006

**Accordingly, regarding claims 4 and 27,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest medical information of a person who is capable of providing the passcode information necessary to access data from the portable memory element, nor does either reference even disclose this use of a portable memory element. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims 4 or 27.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 5, 28, 34 and 41,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest passcode information comprising at least one fingerprint of a person associated with the portable memory element, or a fingerprint reader for reading this information. Nor, as described hereinabove, does Fisher alone, or Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest any passcode associated with the portable memory element, wherein the passcode is necessary to access data from the portable memory element.

Instead, Fisher would appear to disclose a personal identification number (PIN) that is used to confirm information on a software smart card, but this does not control the access to information from the software smart card, as does the passcode control access to information on the portable memory element of the instant application. Moreover, the passcode/passkey – which terms appear to be used synonymously -- of the Raven reference would appear to be used to control an exit in a multi user role-playing environment, and not for controlling the access to information on a portable memory element. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims 5, 28, 34 or 41.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 6 and 29,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest passcode information necessary to access information on the portable memory element, wherein the passcode information comprises either alphanumeric information or biometric information provided by a person associated with the portable memory element. More particularly, neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest a portable memory element, or a portable memory element with an associated passcode that controls access to the information thereon. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims 6 or 29.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 8, 21 and 30,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest providing for enabling the first client either to read information from, or to record information to, the portable memory device if the passcode information is authentic for the portable memory element. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **8, 21 or 30**.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 10 and 32,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest the identification of a level of authority of a client, or controlling access to the data responsive to the level of authority. The Examiner has not provided any particular basis from Fisher or Raven that supports the rejection of claim **10**. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **10 or 32**.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 11 and 24,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest providing for a first user associated with the first client to provide the first passkey to at least one second user associated with at least one second client. More particularly, as best understood, Fisher does not appear to disclose communication between users outside the disclosed PAMS (persistent authentication and medication service). In the instant application, the first user provides the passcode to the server, which returns a first passkey to the first user, who then communicates this to the second user over a separate communications channel, who then communicates a corresponding second passkey to the server so as to establish a communication link with the first user via the server. The Raven reference has already been discussed hereinabove in respect of claims **11 and 24**. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **11 or 24**.

**Furthermore, regarding claim 12,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest providing for encrypting signals sent to the second client and decrypting those signals received by the second client. The Examiner has not provided any particular basis from Fisher or Raven that supports the rejection of claim **12**. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claim **12**.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 13 and 22,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest the operation of providing for enabling at least one second client either to read information from, or to record information to, the portable memory device if a second passkey corresponds to a first passkey. More particularly, neither Fisher nor Raven disclose or suggest a portable memory element, nor do Fisher or Raven disclose or suggest a second user reading information from, or recording information to, a portable memory element associated with a first user, nor the control of a process of reading information from, or recording information to, a portable memory element responsive to whether a second passkey provided by second user to a server corresponds to a first passkey provided to a first user by the server. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **13** or **22**.

**Furthermore, regarding claims 14 and 15,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest a CORBAMED system, let alone a CORBAMED system comprising a Terminology Query Service server, a Clinical Observation Access Service server, and a Resource Access Decision server. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner can only have used hindsight reasoning to suggest that these elements are disclosed by paragraph [0016] of Fisher, as follows:

[0016] There is a need for an improved authentication system, service and methods which provides for collaboration between business partners in an authenticated environment mediated by a third party so as to prevent repudiation of the collaboration.

Neither Fisher nor Raven make any mention of the terms “COBAMED”, “Terminology Query Service server”, “Clinical Observation Access Service server”, or “Resource Access Decision server”, let alone even a medical application for their inventions. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claims **14** and **15**.

**Furthermore, regarding claim 17,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest either a CORBAMED system, or a method of communicating the at least one trait to the CORBAMED system and communicating data from the CORBAMED system corresponding to the at least one trait to at least one of the first client and the at least one second client. Furthermore, neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, even disclose or suggest the use of a portable memory

element in the context of a CORBAMED system. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner can only have used hindsight reasoning to suggest that these elements are disclosed by paragraph [0130] of Fisher, which as best understood, refers only generally to communication amongst servers, without any specific disclosure or suggestion of the elements and limitations of claim 17. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claim 17.

**Furthermore, regarding claim 18,** Applicant respectfully submits that neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest either a CORBAMED system, or at least one trait defined in accordance with a Health Level 7 (HL7) specification. The Examiner contends that defining said at least one trait in in accordance with a Health Level 7 (HL7) specification is a design choice, but has not provided any specific information to substantiate this. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for rejecting claim 18.

Applicant respectfully submits that the neither Fisher alone, nor Fisher in view of Raven, disclose or suggest the elements and limitations of claims **2-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-30, 32, 34, 38, 41 and 42**. Because of this, Applicant respectfully submits that claims **2-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-30, 32, 34, 38, 41 and 42** are distinguished from Fisher and Raven, and that the rejections under **35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)** of claims **2-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-30, 32, 34, 38, 41 and 42** are not justified. Furthermore, it would appear that the Examiner has used impermissible hindsight reasoning in view of the teachings of the instant application to assert these claim rejections. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully traverses all of these rejections on the grounds that the Examiner has not established a prima facie basis for making the rejections. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of claims **2-6, 8, 10-15, 17, 18, 21, 22, 24-30, 32, 34, 38, 41 and 42** in view of the above argument.

**Extension of Time and Payment of Fees Under 37 CFR § 1.17(a)(2)**  
**Authorization to Charge Fee Deficiencies**

Applicant hereby petitions for a Two-Month Extension of Time, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §1.136, extending the deadline for response up to and including 24 January 2007, resulting in an associated fee of **\$225** under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(2). A Credit Card Payment Form in the amount of **\$225** is enclosed herewith for payment of the fee under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(2). The Commissioner is authorized to charge any deficiencies or credit any overpayments – that cannot otherwise be made to the credit card -- to Deposit Account **04-1131**.

**Summary and Conclusions**

The specification and drawings have been corrected to provide for consistent usage of the associated reference signs. Claim **20** has been amended to provide for proper antecedent basis of a term used therein. The claim rejections have been traversed. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter has been added by this amendment. Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is now in the proper form for Notice of Allowance, and respectfully requests a timely issuance thereof in this application.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Kurt L. VanVoorhies, Ph.D., P.E./ #38,643

Raggio & Dinnin, P.C.  
2701 Cambridge Court, Suite 410  
Auburn Hills, MI 48326  
COR-001-US (1221-00001)  
24 January 2007

Kurt L. VanVoorhies, Ph.D., P.E.  
Registration No. 38,643  
Phone: 248-364-2100  
Facsimile: 248-364-2200